

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/806,980

Applicant(s)

CHEUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Phu K. Nguyen

Art Unit

2628

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Phu K. Nguyen.

(3) Chris McDonald.

(2) William P. Jensen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 May 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-52.

Identification of prior art discussed: Holden (Voxelgeo 1.1).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2300

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representatives address the rejections on the Office action mailed January 5, 2007. Examiner agrees that the rejection under 35 USC 101 will be withdrawn under the PTO new guidelines (for the purpose of 101 issue, the practicality of the invention is established when found in either the disclosure or the claim); and the 101, 112, 1st and 103(a) rejections will be withdrawn if the claims are amended to show meaning of the claimed "real time;" e.g., "sufficiently fast to be perceived in real time as the 3D probes is moved," or "substantially at the same time as the 3D sampling probe is moved." Applicant will provide a formal response, which addresses ALL the the rejections as discussed and amends the claims as proposed; in response, Examiner will withdraw the rejections and allow the claims if a further search yields no other related reference.



PHU K. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2300